



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,436	03/30/2001	Nevenka Dimitrova	US 010161	8474

24737 7590 02/25/2005

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

SHANG, ANNAN Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/822,436

Applicant(s)

DIMITROVA ET AL.

Examiner

Annan Q Shang

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/03, 2/02
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Goddard (6,684,240)**.

As to claim 1, note the **Goddard** reference figures 1-3 and 5, discloses method of setting parental lock levels based on example content and further discloses a method for dynamically filtering the content of a multimedia program in real time on a segment-by-segment basis responsive to a filter criteria, comprising:

the claimed “extracting audio, video, and transcript features from segments...” is met by Central Processing System (CPS) 602 of Information Appliance (IA) or Set-top box (STB) 200 (figs. 2, 3, col. 3, lines 28-55, col. 5, lines 14-33 and col. 12, lines 25-45), which extracts Content “audio, video” and rating parameters “transcript features” (col. 3, lines 31-33) from content of segments comprising the media “multimedia” program (col. 3, line 61-67); generating rating levels or parameters “a numeric ranking” (col. 4, lines 1-11 and col. 9, line 57-col. 10, line 29) for the violence or sexual themes or rating parameters or schemes “filter criteria” for each of the content of segment (col. 7, line 42-

col. 8, line 5 and lines 17-22); and when the respective rating level for the content of segments exceeds a threshold, processing that content of segment to thereby eliminate material corresponding to the violence or sexual themes or rating parameters or schemes (col. 8, line 43-col. 9, line 20, line 57-col. 10, line 14).

As to claim 2, Goddard further discloses where the filter criteria, corresponds to language included in the segment being processed (col. 11, lines 5-14 and lines 42-46); and the audio portion of the segment is modified during the processing step (col. 6, lines 42-55, col. 7, lines 11-51 and line 65-col. 8, line 5).

As to claim 3, Goddard further discloses where the filter criteria corresponds to an image included in the segment being processed and the video portion of the segment is modified during the processing step (col. 6, lines 42-55, col. 7, lines 11-51 and line 65-col. 8, line 5).

As to claim 4, Goddard further discloses where the filter criteria corresponds to an image included in the segment being processed and the video portion of the segment is skipped during the processing step (col. 6, lines 42-55, col. 7, lines 11-51 and line 65-col. 8, line 5).

As to claim 5, Goddard further discloses where the rating level(s) or parameters is weighted rating levels or ranking (col. 3, lines 28-42 and col. 4, lines 1-11 and col. 7, lines 31-51).

As to claim 6, Goddard further discloses where each weighted factor employed in generating the weighted rating levels identifies a characteristic of a respective viewer of the media program (col. 9, col. 9, line 57-col. 10, line 29).

Art Unit: 2614

As to claim 7, Goddard further discloses where the rating level(s) for each segment, is generated by comparing the content of each segment to the filter criteria (col. 3, lines 28-42, col. 7, lines 31-41 and col. 8, line 43-col. 9, line 15).

As to claim 8, Goddard further discloses where rating levels for proximate ones of the segments each exceed the threshold, merging the proximate ones of the segments and any intervening segments to thereby produce a merged segment (col. 7, lines 11-30, col. 8, lines 43-col. 9, line 15 and col. 10, lines 29-col. 11, line 4) and processing the merged segment to thereby eliminate material corresponding to the filter criteria (col. 6, lines 1-14).

As to claims 9-11, Goddard further discloses different "first and second" filter criteria and generating different rating levels for respective different filter criteria for each segments (col. 7, line 42-col. 8, line 5 and lines 43-65) and when the respective rating level "first" and "second numeric ranking" for that segment exceeds a first threshold, processing that segment to thereby eliminate material corresponding to one of the filter criteria or the first or second filter criteria (col. 5, line 49-col. 6, line 14, lines 34-55 and col. 8, line 66-col. 9, line 15) where the different filter criteria is associated with passive users (col. 9, line 57-col. 10, line 14) and comprises a different set of filter criteria where one is a subset of the other set (col. 11, lines 5-29).

As to claim 12-14, Goddard further discloses where a parent provides training segments having content corresponding to the filter criteria; and learning to identify content matching the filter criteria (col. 6, lines 34-55 and col. 10, lines 15-45), note that the authorized user or parent the first time the user blocks example content, the

Art Unit: 2614

acceptable content rating parameters of the AI or STB 200 will be set to the content rating of the content and as the user selects additional example content are adjusted or fine tuned to desired level of filtering, furthermore the parent can select group of users for which a television program similar to the program currently being viewed are to be blocked in the future the AI or STB 200 learns and adjusts the rating levels for that user of group of users accordingly, where the learning is performed by AI or STB 200.

As to claim 15, Goddard further discloses where the filter criteria, is freely selectable from different predefined filter criteria (col. 6, lines 34-55, col. 7, lines 26-col. 8, line 1+ and col. 10, lines 15-55).

As to claim 16, note the **Goddard** reference figures 1-3 and 5, discloses method of setting parental lock levels based on example content and further discloses a parental control system filtering objectionable material from a multimedia program in program in accordance with a filter criteria, comprising:

the claimed "a transcript analysis module extracting first audible features and text..." "a visual analysis module extracting video features..." and "an audio analysis module extracting second audible features..." are met by Central Processing System (CPS) 602 of Information Appliance (IA) or Set-top box (STB) 200 (figs. 2, 3, col. 3, lines 28-55, col. 5, lines 14-33 and col. 12, lines 25-45), which is a transcript analysis module for extracting audio and text "first audible features and text," from a sequence of segments included in the media 'multimedia' program (col. 3, line 61-67); a visual analysis module for extracting video "video features" from the sequence of segments including media program; and an audio analysis module for extracting audio "second

Art Unit: 2614

audible features” from the sequence of segments included in media program (col. 3, lines 38-55, col. 6, lines 1-14, lines 34-55, col. 7, lines 31-53), note that the IA or STB 200 can dynamically adjust the filters to acceptable content rating parameters of the content (segments of audio, video, text, etc.,) accepting different content and adjusting or fine tuning (col. 6, lines 42-48), modifying, (col. 7, lines 31-41) etc., the acceptable content rating parameters based on the comparison; CPS 602 of IA or STB 200 is also “an analyzer” and “a filter” for generating rating levels “a numeric ranking” (col. 4, lines 1-11) for the violence or sexual themes or rating parameters or schemes “filter criteria” for each of the content of segment (col. 7, line 42-col. 8, line 5 and lines 17-22); and when the respective rating level for the content of segments exceeds a threshold, filtering that content of segment to thereby eliminate material corresponding to the violence or sexual themes or rating parameters or schemes (col. 8, line 43-col. 9, line 20, line 57-col. 10, line 14).

As to claim 17, Goddard further discloses where the filter modifies different content of the respective segments (col. 6, lines 34-55, col. 7, line 42-col. 8, line 5 and col. 10, line 15-45).

Claim 18 is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 3.

Claim 19 is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 4.

Claims 20-21 are met as previously discussed with respect to claim 5-6.

Claims 22-24 are met as previously discussed with respect to claim 12-14.

As to claims 25-26 and 28, Goddard further discloses where a television set, STB and client software device incorporates the parental control system (fig. 2, col. 3, lines 61-67 and col. 5, lines 5-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Goddard (6,684,240)** as applied to claim 16 above, and in view of **Barsness (6,829,582)**.

As to claim 27, Goddard suggest that fails to explicitly teach where a personal video recorder (PVR).

However, **Barsness** discloses controlled access to audio signals based on objectionable audio content detected via sound recognition, which includes a television reception where the audio/video signals is receive from PVR.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a PVR into the system of Goddard and manage or have control of the multimedia data, with desired rating levels.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Schneidewend (6,529,526) discloses system for processing programs and program content rating information derived from multiple broadcast sources.

Casement et al (6,144,401) disclose television schedule system with access control.

Cragun et al (5,973,683) disclose dynamic regulation of television viewing content based on viewer profile and viewing history.


Collings (5,828,402) discloses method and apparatus for selectively blocking audio and video signals.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Annan Q Shang** whose telephone number is **703-305-2156**. The examiner can normally be reached on **700am-500pm**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **John W Miller** can be reached on **703-305-4795**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **703-872-9306**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the **Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)**.

Annan Q. Shang.


JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600